

Remarks

In the first Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner further objected to the specification because of informalities.

The Examiner also objected to claims 5, 7, 9, 16 and 17 because of informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in the claims. The Examiner also stated that the claims are generally narrative and indefinite in failing to conform with current U.S. practice.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,906,274 issued to McEwan (hereinafter "McEwan"). The Examiner objects to claims 3-10 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McEwan. The Examiner further rejects claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McEwan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,938 issued to Cheris, (hereinafter Cheris). Finally, the Examiner indicates that claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form with all the limitations of the base claims.

By way of response, Applicant has amended the specification and cancelled claims 12, 13, 16 and 17 and amended claims 1-11, 14-15 and 18 and added new claim 19. Applicant believes the application as amended places the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Objections To The Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified by the claims. The Examiner stated that the "two hooks" and "holder part" must be shown in the drawings of cancelled from the claims. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. The "two hooks" and "holder part" mentioned in the claims have been amended to more accurately reflect the drawings.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of informalities such as the misspelling of "gripe" which should have been spelled "grip" throughout the disclosure. Applicant has made appropriate corrections as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, the Applicant has made extensive revisions to the specification in order to comply with standard U.S. practice. No new subject matter is being submitted by way of these amendments.

Claim Objections

Claims 5, 7, 9, 16 and 17 were objected to because of formalities such as the misspelling of "gripe" which should be spelled as "grip." Claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled and claims 5, 7 and 9 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, claims 1-11, 14-15 and 18 have been amended to conform with current U.S. practice.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner rejected claim 3 because there was insufficient antecedent basis for "the connection." The Examiner also rejected claim 6 because there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the hinging connection." Finally, the Examiner rejected claim 7 because there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the cover for" and "the holder part."

The Examiner also generally objected to the claims as being indefinite and failing to conform with current U.S. practice.

By way of this Amendment, the Applicant has corrected the antecedent basis in claims 3, 6 and 7 to conform with current U.S. practice. In addition, claims 1-11, 14-15 and 18 have been amended to conform with current U.S. practice. All grammatical and idiomatic errors have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by McEwan. MPEP § 2131 recites: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." McEwan does not disclose each and every element as set forth in claim 1 as amended. McEwan does not teach a holder that includes a tight thread connected to at least one hook and a button that rests upon the thread. As such, Applicant believes the claimed invention as amended is not anticipated by McEwan. Applicant respectfully suggests the claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant submits that claims 2-11, 14-15 and 18, which depend from the allowable subject matter in independent claim 1, are also in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by McEwan. Further, claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McEwan and further in view of Cheris. For the reasons set forth more fully above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's combination of the references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as set forth in the claims. The rejected claims depend from allowable subject matter presented in independent claim 1. Applicant contends that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that the independent claim is patentable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims 3-10, 14-16 and 17-18.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As stated above, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 12 and 13 as suggested by the Examiner. Further, since claims 2-11, 14-15 and 18, as amended, depend from allowable subject matter in the independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims as amended are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the claims as presented in this response is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant has made a genuine effort to respond to each and every one of the Examiner's rejections to advance prosecution of this case. Applicant believes all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, for which action is respectfully requested.

The Petition fee of \$65.00 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

LINTA COSTEL

By /John E. Nemazi/

John E. Nemazi

Reg. No. 30,876

Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 15, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351